



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,915	11/13/2003	Hye Jeong Jeon	24286/81451	7327

7590 04/03/2006

Peter H. Kang
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
Suite 2000
555 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715

EXAMINER

DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/705,915	JEON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James J. Debrow	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 28-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 28-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/13/03; 4/12/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/9/04; 2/13/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 13 Nov 2003.
2. Claims 26, and 28-80 are pending in this case. Claims 26, 36, 46, 47, 57, 58, 69, and 70 are independent claim.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed **Feb.13, 2006** fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because there is not an English translation of the foreign NPL document dated Jan 20, 2006. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Specification does not disclose the term "fragment(s)" as recited in claims (see independent claims along with appropriate dependent claims).

Claim Objections

5. **Claim 26** is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 5 of the claim, claim recites "the document *transmission* device", wherein line 4 of the claim, applicant amended the claim to recite "a document receiving device". The examiner believes this to be an over-sight on behalf of the applicant during the amendment of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

6. **Claim 28** is objected to because of the following informalities: This claim recites the term "lower fragment". The specification makes no mention of a "lower fragment", however the specification recites the term "lower structure". In accordance with the usage of the term "lower structure" within the specification, the examiner believes the use of the term "lower fragment" to be in error on behalf of the applicant. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. **Claim 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim recites the term "*lower fragment*" and "*upper fragment*". It is unclear to the examiner as to how applicant identifies/distinguishes the "*lower fragment*" of a document from the "*upper fragment*" of the document.

Clarification is required in the matter.

9. **Claims 40- 42, 52- 54, 63-65, and 75-77** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims recite the term "*lower structure*" and "*upper structure*". It is unclear to the examiner as to how applicant identifies/distinguishes the "*lower fragment*" of a document from the "*upper fragment*" of the document. Clarification is required in the matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 26, 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (Pub. No.: 2004/0015369 A1; Filing Date: Aug. 9, 2002) in view of Dean et al. (Pub No.: 2002/0152244 A1; Filing Date: Dec. 22, 2000), further in view of Anderson et al. (Patent No.: 5,499,365; Patent Date: Mar. 12, 1996).**

In regards to independent claim 26, Kim et al. disclose *a document management system, comprising:*

a document storage device configured to store a plurality of XML electronic documents (0009 lines 1-4; 0049 lines 8-13; Kim et al discloses a storage device for storing XML type documents); and a document receiving device coupled to the document storage device, wherein the document transmission device is configured to process one of multiple versions of an XML electronic document according to a version value of the versions of the XML electronic document (0009 lines 1-4 & 9-13; 0046 lines 5-6; Kim et al discloses a database for storing documents and managing the different versions of the document).

Kim et al. does not disclose expressly *the contents of at least one XML electronic document comprise a plurality of individual fragments;*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the contents of at least one XML electronic document comprise a plurality of individual fragments* (0007, lines 12-15).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Kim et al. for the benefit maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. does not disclose expressly *time information of contents of the XML, electronic document are used as the version value.*

However, Anderson et al. discloses *time information of contents of the XML, electronic document are used as the version value* (column 6, lines 30-31).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson et al. with Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. for the benefit maximal reuse of information, allowing selection of a unique version of an document based on time (Anderson et al. column 2, lines 28-29).

In regards to dependent claim 28, Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 26, wherein a lower fragment version value is updated when a lower fragment content of the XML electronic*

document is changed, and wherein a latest lower fragment version value is used as a corresponding upper fragment version value.

However, Anderson et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein a lower fragment version value is updated when a lower fragment content of the XML electronic document is changed, and wherein a latest lower fragment version value is used as a corresponding upper fragment version value* (column 9, lines 19-24).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson et al. with Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. for the benefit maximal reuse of information (Dean et al. 0007, lines 12-13), allowing selection of a unique version of a document based on time (Anderson et al. column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 29, Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 26, wherein each fragment version value includes date and time information according to when said contents of the corresponding fragment was updated.*

However, Anderson et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein each fragment version value includes date and time information according to when said contents of the corresponding fragment was updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson et al. with Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. for the benefit maximal reuse of information (Dean et al. 0007, lines 12-13), allowing selection of a unique version of a document based on time (Anderson et al. column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 30, Kim et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein the document receiving device is configured to request the XML documents* (0049 lines 8-11).

In regard to dependent claim 31, Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 29, wherein said each fragment version value includes date and time information when contents of the corresponding fragment was changed.*

However, Anderson et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 29, wherein said each fragment version value includes date and time information when contents of the corresponding fragment was changed* (column 6, lines 45-47).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anderson et al. with Kim et al. in view of Dean et al. for the benefit maximal reuse of information (Dean et al. 0007, lines 12-13), allowing selection of a unique version of a document based on date and time (Anderson et al. column 2, lines 28-29).

In regard to dependent claim 32, Kim et al. does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 28, wherein a type of the updated lower content is included in the upper fragment version value.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 28, wherein a type of the updated lower content is included in the upper fragment version value* (0020, lines 9-12; Dean et al. teaches that by encapsulation, fragments can be inserted into each other).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Kim et al. for the benefit avoiding scattering and duplication of information (0020, lines 9-12).

In regard to dependent claim 33, Kim et al. does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 26, wherein version information of said contents is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said electronic document.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein version information of said contents is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said electronic document* (0096, lines 1-4).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Kim et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 34, Kim et al. does not disclose expressly the document management system of claim 33, wherein said syntax is XML schema.

However, Dean et al. discloses the document management system of claim 33, wherein said syntax is XML schema (0162; claim 2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Kim et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 35, Kim et al. does not disclose expressly *the document management system of claim 34, wherein said contents includes at least one number selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a broadcasting television program.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 34, wherein said contents includes at least one number selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a broadcasting television program* (0192, lines 10-11).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Kim et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines12-13).

Art Unit: 2176

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 36-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (Patent No.: 5,499,365; Patent Date: Mar. 12, 1996) in view of Dean et al. (Pub No.: 2002/0152244 A1; Filing Date: Dec. 22, 2000).**

In regard to independent claim 36, Anderson et al. discloses a method for updating a fragment stored in a client describing metadata related on a broadcasting program, the method comprising:

*requesting an updated version of said fragment (column 7, lines 26-32);
receiving said updated version of said fragment identified by a fragment identification including a fragment version, wherein said fragment version is date information and/or time information (column 6, lines 30-31; column 7, lines 26-32);*

*Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly said fragment is based on XML;
updating said fragment stored in said client with said received updated version of said fragment.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *said fragment is based on XML* (0007, lines 13-14; 0023).

updating said fragment stored in said client with said received updated version of said fragment (0158 Dean et al. discloses using a *client* editor to create a new document. Dean et al. further discloses references to reusable fragments previously constructed (*fragments stored on the client*) will be included in the new composite documents (*updated version*)).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit maximal reuse of information through the composition of XML fragments (0007, lines 12-15).

In regard to dependent claim 37, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 36, wherein each fragment version includes date and time information according to when contents of the fragment were updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 38, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 37, wherein said each fragment version includes date and time information according to when said contents of the fragment were changed* (column 6, lines 45-47).

In regard to dependent claim 39, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 36, wherein said requesting comprises transmitting a current version of said fragment,*

and wherein said fragment version of said received updated version is later than said fragment version of said current version (column 7, lines 65-66 Anderson et al. discloses an extract sequence attribute, which when is greater than the selection sequence attribute, indicated a later version).

In regard to dependent claim 40, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 36, wherein when a lower structure of said fragment is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of an upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 41, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 40, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 42, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 41, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the upper structure.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 28, wherein a type of the updated lower content is included in the upper fragment version value* (0020, lines 9-12; Dean et al. teaches that by encapsulation, fragments can be inserted into each other).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 43, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 37, wherein said fragment version of said contents is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said fragment.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 26, wherein version information of said contents is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said electronic document* (0096, lines 1-4).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 44, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 43, wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 33, wherein said syntax is XML schema* (0162; claim 2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 45, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 44, wherein said contents includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the document management system of claim 34, wherein said contents includes at least one number selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a broadcasting television program* (0192, lines 10-11).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to independent claim 46, Anderson et al. discloses *a method for updating a fragment stored in a client describing metadata related on a television broadcasting program, the method comprising:*

requesting an updated version of said fragment to a provider (column 7, lines 26-27; Anderson et al. discloses a version selection request. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the request for versions of fragments would typically be for an updated version, and the request would have been sent to the provider of the updated fragment.); *and*

updating said fragment stored in said client with a later version than a version of said fragment stored in said client identified by a fragment identification including a fragment version from said provider, wherein said fragment version is date information

and/or time information (column 6, lines 30-31; column 7, lines 26-32 Anderson et al. discloses a version selection request for an object (*fragment*) is identified based upon the logical key (*version*). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the provider would typically supply the updated fragment along with it's fragment version of the that is transmitted to the client.; column 6, lines 53-65 Anderson et al. discloses a method of updating objects (fragments) identified by the logical keys).

Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *said fragment is based on XML*;

However, Dean et al. discloses *said fragment is based on XML* (0007, lines 13-14; 0023);

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit maximal reuse of information and through the composition of XML fragments (0007, lines 12-15).

In regard to independent claim 47, Anderson et al. discloses *a method for processing a response including an updated version of a fragment stored in a client in response to a request for updating said fragment stored in said client describing metadata related on a broadcasting program, the method comprising:*

updating said fragment stored in said client with said updated version of said fragment identified by an fragment identification including a fragment version, wherein

said fragment version is date information and/or time information (column 6, lines 30-31).

Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *said fragment is based on XML*.

However, Dean et al. disclose *said fragment is based on XML* (0007, lines 13-14; 0023).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information and through the composition of XML fragments (0007, lines 12-15).

In regard to dependent claim 48, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 47, comprising receiving said updated version of said fragment identified by said fragment information and said fragment version from a provider* (column 7, lines 26-32). Anderson et al. discloses a version selection request for an object (fragment) is identified based upon the logical key (version). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the provider would typically supply the updated fragment along with its fragment version of the that is transmitted to the client).

In regard to dependent claim 49, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein each fragment version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the fragment were updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 50, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 49, wherein said each fragment version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the fragment were changed* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 51, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein said request comprises a selected version of said fragment, and wherein said received updated version of said fragment is later than said selected version* (column 7, lines 65-66 Anderson et al. discloses an extract sequence attribute, which when is greater than the selection sequence attribute, indicated a later version).

In regard to dependent claim 52, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein when a lower structure of said fragment is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of a corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 53, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 52, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 54, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 53, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the method of claim 53, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (0020, lines 9-12; Dean et al. teaches that by encapsulation, fragments can be inserted into each other).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 55, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 47, wherein said fragment version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said fragment, and wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein said fragment version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said fragment, and wherein said syntax is XML schema* (0162; claim 2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 56, Anderson et al. *does not disclose expressly the method of claim 47, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program* (0192, lines 10-11).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to independent claim 57, Anderson et al. discloses *a document management system, comprising:*

a document provider device configured to update a fragment describing metadata related on a broadcasting program, wherein the document provider device is configured to process a request for an updated version of said fragment according to a fragment identification including a fragment version value of said fragment (column 6, lines 30-31; column 7, lines 26-32), *wherein the document provider device is configured to supply said updated version of said fragment, wherein date information and/or time information of corresponding metadata of said fragment are used as the fragment version value* (column 6, lines 30-31).

Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *said fragment is based on XML*.

However, Dean et al. disclose *said fragment is based on XML* (0007, lines 13-14; 0023).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information and through the composition of XML fragments (0007, lines 12-15).

In regard to independent claim 58, Anderson et al. discloses *a method for providing a fragment describing metadata related on a broadcasting program, the method comprising:*

receiving a request for an updated version of said fragment from said client
(column 7, lines 26-27);

determining a provider has a capability of handling said version requests; and supplying said updated version of said fragment in accordance with a determined result, wherein said fragment version is date information and/or time information (column 6, lines 30-31).

Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *said fragment is based on XML*.

However, Dean et al. disclose *said fragment is based on XML* (0007, lines 13-14; 0023).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information and through the composition of XML fragments (0007, lines 12-15).

In regard to dependent claim 59, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 58, wherein said request for said updated version of said fragment identifies said fragment using fragment identification and a current fragment version* (column 7, lines 26-32 Anderson et al. discloses a version selection request for an object (*fragment*) is identified based upon the logical key (*version*)).

In regard to dependent claim 60, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 58, comprising identifying a version of said fragment later than a requested version of said fragment in said provider as said updated version of said fragment* (column 7, lines 65-66 Anderson et al. discloses an extract sequence attribute, which when is greater than the selection sequence attribute, indicated a later version).

In regard to dependent claim 61, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 58, wherein each fragment version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the fragment were updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 62, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 61, wherein said each fragment version includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the fragment were changed* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 63, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 58, wherein when a lower structure of said fragment is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of a corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 64, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 63, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 65, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 64, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the method of claim 64, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (0020, lines 9-12; Dean et al. teaches that by encapsulation, fragments can be inserted into each other).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 66, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 58, wherein said fragment version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said fragment.*

However, Dean et al. discloses the method of claim 58, wherein said fragment version is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said fragment (0113, lines 5-8; 0162; claim 2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 67, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 66, wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Dean et al. discloses the method of claim 66, wherein said syntax is XML schema. (0162; claim 2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 68, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 67, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Dean et al. discloses *the method of claim 47, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program* (0192, lines 10-11).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to independent claim 69, Anderson et al. discloses *a method for replying to a request for updating a fragment stored in a client describing metadata related on a broadcasting program, the method comprising:*

supplying said client with an updated version of said fragment identified by a fragment identification including an fragment version, wherein said fragment version is date information and/or time information (column 6, lines 30-31).

Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *said fragment is based on XML.*

However, Dean et al. disclose *said fragment is based on XML* (0007, lines 13-14; 0023).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information and through the composition of XML fragments (0007, lines 12-15).

In regard to independent claim 70, Anderson et al. discloses *a method for managing a fragment stored in a client describing metadata related on a television broadcasting program, the method comprising:*

using a version information of said fragment, wherein said version information is date information and/or time information (column 6, lines 30-31).

Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *said fragment is based on XML*.

However, Dean et al. disclose *said fragment is based on XML* (0007, lines 13-14; 0023).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information and through the composition of XML fragments (0007, lines 12-15).

In regard to dependent claim 71, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 70, comprising transmitting updated versions of said fragment identified by said fragment information including at least said fragment version information* (column 7, lines 26-32 Anderson et al. discloses a version selection request for an object

Art Unit: 2176

(fragment) is identified based upon the logical key (version). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the provider would typically supply the updated fragment along with it's fragment version of the that is transmitted to the client).

In regard to dependent claim 72, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 71, wherein each fragment version information includes date and time information according to when said metadata of said fragment were updated* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 73, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 72, wherein said each fragment version information includes date and time information according to when said metadata of the fragment were changed* (column 6, lines 30-31).

In regard to dependent claim 74, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 71, comprising receiving a request for an updated version of said fragment* (column 7, lines 26-27).

In regard to dependent claim 75, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 70, wherein when a lower' structure of said fragment is changed, a version value of the lower structure is updated and the updated version value is reflected in a version value of a corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 76, Anderson et al. discloses *the method of claim 75, wherein a largest value of the version values of the lower structures is used as the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (column 9, lines 19-24).

In regard to dependent claim 77, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 76, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure*.

However, Dean et al. discloses *the method of claim 76, wherein a type of the updated lower structure is included in the version value of the corresponding upper structure* (0020, lines 9-12; Dean et al. teaches that by encapsulation, fragments can be inserted into each other).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 78, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 70, wherein said fragment version information is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said fragment*.

However, Dean et al. discloses *the method of claim 70, wherein said fragment version information is defined by a syntax defining a structure of said fragment* (0113, lines 5-8; 0162; claim 2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 79, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 78, wherein said syntax is XML schema.*

However, Dean et al. discloses the method of claim 78, wherein said syntax is XML schema (0162; claim 2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

In regard to dependent claim 80, Anderson et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 79, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program.*

However, Dean et al. discloses the method of claim 79, wherein said metadata includes at least one member selected from the group of title, synopsis, review, and casting of a television broadcasting program (0192, lines 10-11).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Dean et al. with Anderson et al. for the benefit of maximal reuse of information (0007, lines 12-13).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Doug Hutton", with a stylized, sweeping flourish at the end.

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100